

[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Leg.]

## YEAS—45

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Grassley	McConnell
Barrasso	Hatch	Moran
Blunt	Heller	Murkowski
Boozman	Hoeben	Portman
Brown (MA)	Hutchison	Pryor
Burr	Inhofe	Risch
Chambliss	Isakson	Roberts
Coats	Johanns	Rubio
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cochran	Kirk	Shelby
Corker	Kyl	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Lieberman	Vitter
DeMint	Lugar	Wicker

## NAYS—55

Akaka	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Reed
Bennet	Inouye	Reid
Bingaman	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Kerry	Sanders
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Shaheen
Cantwell	Landrieu	Snowe
Cardin	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Collins	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Conrad	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)	

The amendment (No. 626), as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays are 55. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for about 6 or 7 minutes on a trade issue that normally I would be offering an amendment on. I am not going to offer an amendment during this debate because I think it is very important we move forward with this legislation so, hopefully, the President will stop moving the goalposts and send to the Senate Panama, Colombia, and South Korea.

But the reason I address the issue of the general system of preferences is because, quite frankly, I am sick and tired of a lot of nations—that may not be considered developed yet but advanced very rapidly in the last 20 years—taking advantage of our GSP system. I do not mind them taking advantage of our GSP system, but what irritates me is a lot of times in WTO negotiations, they are the very same countries that are finding fault with the United States and Europe not giving enough on agricultural issues, as an example, at the very same time these countries have very high tariffs on our products getting into their country, when they get, under GSP, their products into our country duty free.

So, Mr. President, I want you to know I appreciate the fact we are finally debating the merits of trade legislation.

Most people agree that one way we can help our economy is by opening and expanding markets for American-made products. I look forward to the President, as I just said, sending us the free-trade agreements. In the meantime, much of the discussion has centered on the bill before us, the GSP and the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program.

While it is important for us to have a discussion on the merits of TAA, I do not want my colleagues to overlook the significance of the underlying bill. This bill extends the general system of preferences. This program provides one-way—and I want to emphasize—duty-free access to U.S. markets. So over a period of several decades, we have been awfully good to a lot of countries that we think we ought to help and we have been helping.

The basic principle, then, behind the GSP is to provide certain goods made in developing countries with preferential market access to the United States in the form of this duty-free status. The intention is to help spur economic growth in developing nations.

I support the premise that we can help developing countries by promoting trade. But I can also tell you that our patience is getting very thin with some of those countries, particularly when we see them not reciprocating in a way that they have the capability of reciprocating. Our trade relations, however, should increasingly be based upon reciprocity by which other countries will provide the same open access to U.S. exports. In other words, as those countries become more developed, we need to require that they move toward operating on a level playing field with the United States.

Congress needs to take, then, a hard look at GSP and scrutinize whether it is helping accomplish the U.S. trade agenda. I think we would find some of these countries coming up short. In another environment of discussing trade, I would be taking a different approach: that we would send a clear signal to some of these countries of our impatience, and they are going to have to graduate off GSP. If other nations believe they will always enjoy GSP, then what incentives do they have to open their markets to U.S. goods? That is why we ought to very much advance the system of graduating off GSP with some of those countries.

There are nations that benefit from GSP that, quite frankly, have moved beyond what I consider to be developing countries. I continue to question why we provide preferential treatment at all to the products from countries such as Brazil and India. These countries have at times worked against the trade interests of the United States, including resistance to reducing high tariffs on U.S. exports. Both of these countries have countless products com-

peting in the global market with U.S. products.

I am not offering an amendment, as I have already said, to this GSP bill, not because I do not think my position is good but because I want to see the pending trade agreements submitted and approved by the Congress. I am not interested in raising any barriers that make that task more difficult than the President has already made it.

However, I will continue to push for reform of GSP. I urge my colleagues to take a close look at this program and consider the points I have raised in the past and I am raising right now but not raising in the form of an amendment that ought to be offered at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## DISASTER RELIEF

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know the short debate we had, just in the last couple of hours, and the votes are important, about the Senate and the House figuring out a way as to how to move forward on some of the trade agreements that are pending, and the appropriate ways to make sure American workers are not left behind, that they are actually helped and supported. And those issues are very important.

But I come to the floor today to talk again about another important issue that is pending before the Congress right now that is of extreme importance to millions and millions of Americans who are following this debate through the viewing of the procedures here on the Senate floor and in the House, and also following on Twitter and other Internet sites and opportunities on their local news and radio stations about what we are doing on disaster relief.

That is a good question because I think—and many of the Senators, Democrats and Republicans, as well, on the Senate side; particularly 10 of my colleagues from the other side who stood with us last week to say—it is time to fund the disasters in America today.

We are questioning why the House of Representatives is dragging its feet on this important issue or why the leadership, the Republican leadership in the House would be even hesitating to fund the ongoing needs of FEMA, the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Housing and Urban Development through community development block grant funding and agricultural disaster relief, which is so important.

In disasters, sometimes the pictures are focused on cities or suburbs, and it is heartwrenching.